Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Combined with the Magazine ANALYSIS
Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA LIBRARY MAY '51

VOL. VIII, NO. 20, *Issue Number* 381, MAY 16, 1951 ★ *Editor:* FRANK C. HANIGHEN ★ *Associate Editor:* FRANK CHODOROV

HARVARD HOGS THE HEADLINES

By William F. Buckley, Jr.

As a Yale man, I think I have a legitimate gripe. Harvard saw the light of day seventy-five years before my alma mater, and has capitalized on this ever since. Yale has never lost the inferiority complex she got from Harvard's abortive arrival on the educational scene. This must be the explanation of why Harvard gets most of the credit for nourishing the new, irresistible, mid-century liberalism -- collectivism.

Yale deserves just as much credit for it.

It's true that Harvard does things more flamboyantly. Most of this country's collectivists, admittedly, have been comforted and inspired, at one time or another, by the highly publicized speeches and writings of Alvin Hansen, Seymour Harris, Felix Frankfurter and the rest. Yale hasn't counterparts of such notoriety. It is also true that Washington has been inundated, over the past fifteen years, by precocious statists who received their enlightenment in Cambridge, and that these men have signally influenced national policy. Yale lags behind in the infiltration of the bureaucracy.

But Yale goes about her task differently. She doesn't make so many headlines, she doesn't contribute so much grist for Westbrook Pegler's columns, so many clerks for Supreme Court Justices, or so many articles for the New Republic. But in a very real sense, Yale is more systematic. She goes about her task of collectivizing less ostentatiously. But let no one say that Yale is not pulling her oar, that she is shirking her responsibility to persuade her young men as to the merits of the Leviathan State.

II

Yale recognizes that the most important single springboard from which to launch collectivism is the basic economics course. Approximately half of her undergraduates enroll in "Elementary Economics" before leaving New Haven. And so it is here that much of the work can be done.

To that end, in the past five years, books by Samuelson (Economics: An Introductory Analysis), Bowman and Bach (Economic Analysis and Public

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Policy), Morgan (Income and Employment), and Tarshis (The Elements of Economics), have been used as basic texts.

Now all of these books profess respect for the institution and achievements of free enterprise, a tactic indispensable, at the present, to successful collectivizing. Socialism still has to be subtle. So it is only after calculated enthusiasm for our economic system that these text writers proceed to undermine the free market place. This approach is far more effective, in my opinion, than a hundred lectures at Harvard by Harold Laski. For he bore the label "socialist", and his straightforwardness put many of his students on their guard.

Not so with the text writers of Yale economics (whose approach is adopted by most of the instructors). For it is under the banner of "the preservation of capitalism" that they teach the unwary student to forsake every tenet of free enterprise. For example: economic equilibrium cannot result from an unmolested free market, and capitalism, accordingly, must be modified. "To set the responsibility for attaining and maintaining full employment on the shoulders of individual consumers or individual businessmen, is absurd." (Morgan). Individualism "is giving way to changing concepts of what is meant by true equality of opportunity in economic affairs". (Bowman and Bach).

Since we've seen that the American economy has got to change, some of its traditional superstitions have got to go. There is no "right" of private property, and the freedom to engage in business for one's self "is not a basic freedom". (Morgan). And since there is no right of private property, the State must remedy the appalling inequality of income which "most Americans regard as inequitable". (Bowman and Bach).

Such income inequality, which seriously vitiates "maximum social well-being" (Tarshis) must and will be abolished by State intervention through taxation. This is a "generally accepted objective" of modern economics. (Morgan).

Nor shall inheritance escape the egalitarian axe; everyone, after all, is "curious about the workings of an economic society that enables a few individuals to amass such large accumulations of wealth and power and to perpetuate them by inheritance". (Samuelson). So, by plugging loopholes and raising the rates, "there is no reason why we should not achieve at least the level of success of the British in increasing the productivity of death taxes". (Morgan).

Once the government has seen to equalization, it is only fair that it should also assume the burden of guaranteeing security to all its citizens. This is democracy at work, for "cradle-to-grave security has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great popularity. If the private economy cannot supply it [which it cannot, the students are repeatedly told], naturally people will insist upon getting it artificially from governments". (Samuelson).

Thus we must have more and more social security, forced separation wages, and a government guarantee of full employment. (Morgan).

Unemployment can, of course, be offset by government spending -- and it doesn't much matter how the government spends just so it spends: "Wise domestic investment is no more powerful than ultimately foolish investment." (Samuelson). Morgan quotes the god of all our enlightened economists, Lord Keynes, who wrote that "Pyramid building, earthquakes, and even wars may serve to increase wealth".

Those students who object to limitless government spending are quickly disabused of such reactionary objections. "The fear that increasing the public debt will make the nation go bankrupt is almost completely fallacious." (Bowman and Bach). "In the last analysis there is no problem, for the simple reason that the government controls the Federal Reserve Banks and can always compel them to buy government bonds." (Tarshis). Besides, the government "has complete power to issue new currency". (Samuelson).

III

So it goes, and the student is pretty well convinced, after the year's work, that he can at last visualize a program for fortifying free enterprise. He doesn't realize that this program involves destroying everything basic to the free economy -- private property, production by private enterprise, production for profit and regulation by free competition. Our economy is already mixed (i.e. the post office, education); we need only mix it some more. We can go as far as England -- and even further, and still be a capitalistic nation, for even "when the British Labor Government completes the socialization program underway . . . some 80 per cent of national production will still be in private hands, only 20 per cent in the hands of the government". (Morgan).

There is not a deficiency in our society -- social or even ethical -- that remedial action by the <u>government</u> cannot cure. And we all know that there is no surer way to sensitize man's mind to collectivism than to teach him to turn instinctively to Government as the agent through which all good is accomplished.

In more advanced courses in economics, although they are not as important because the attendance is smaller, Yale sticks pretty close to the same line -- the "mixed economy" line, which is really bearing fruit. The Department of Economics is slightly troubled by three or four old-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

timers who keep ranting about such things as "limited government" (anarchists, the lot of them), "the gold standard" (does Tarshis put them in their place! He compares the gold standard to a limburger-cheese standard!), the threat of authoritarianism in the planned economy (these boys never heard of economic democracy), and other such archaisms.

But they're pretty old men. One has already retired. Another goes this year, and the other two within a few years. Their juniors know a good deal better than they.

IV

To get back to Harvard: I'd pit the average Yale graduate of basic economics against the average Harvard man confident that my alma mater has turned out the more efficacious collectivist. For one thing, when the boy goes to Harvard he is made aware, if not by George Sokolsky, then by his father, or uncle, that he is entering a hotbed of radicalism, with the result that many entering freshmen and graduating seniors are more critical of the theories passed on to them in the classroom.

But when a student goes to Yale, all of his friends and relations relax, because Old Yale is so conservative. The student falls for it, and readily swallows his economics lessons, and others, as the point of view of the right. If he is intellectually restless, he is more prone to move to the left than to the right, because so far as he knows, there is nothing to the right of Yale economics.

Occasionally, some Yale alumni do a little spade work, read some of the texts, get riled up and write in letters protesting the promulgation of socialist values. These few objectors can be easily dismissed as "fascists". They certainly are not typical Yale men -- the kind who remain Yale men under all circumstances, who never fail to come to the aid of Yale when called upon.

Only this year the alumni have launched an endowment drive of $80 million to meet its annual deficit. Assuming that Yale men are committed to maintaining individualism in America, this drive is like asking them to furnish the rods with which the next generation shall whip them. But, I don't look at it this way. I prefer to think that Yale fund-raising drives show evidence of genuine and disinterested altruism -- typical of the man with the Yale degree.

Nevertheless, in this business of spreading socialist ideas, we do sit around and let Harvard hog the headlines.

William F. Buckley, Jr., a recent Yale graduate, will shortly publish a book recounting the collectivistic and agnostic trend at his alma mater.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmal rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events Vol. VIII, No. 20

'51 LIBRARY

By Frank C. Hanighen May 16, 1951

TALK OF PEACE: Peace rumors touched off during the past week by remarks of Senators Kefauver and Flanders have not the slightest substance, according to well-informed sources in the Capital.

But there is this much to the current talk of peace: HUMAN EVENTS has obtained information that the White House is seeking a channel through which it could indirectly achieve the purpose of "talking things over" with Stalin. The scheme under consideration -- as relayed to us in brief outline -- resembles that planned by Truman in 1948 when the President wanted to dispatch Chief Justice Vinson to Moscow. This plan was suddenly called off during the last weeks of the presidential campaign of that year.

This time, however, an individual in private life, rather than an official, would be used as an emissary. Indeed, this column has received assurances that the Administration is seriously considering none other than the Hon. Joseph E. Davies for the task.

Mr. Davies served as Ambassador to Russia and knows Stalin. It is necessary -- and important -- to remember that Mr. Davies gave a very rosy view of the Soviet Union in his wartime book Mission to Moscow. Also, he is a friend of Justice Vinson.

* * * * *

MACARTHUR VICTORIES: In the unlikely event that a peace agreement should be reached, and if it should prove to be no appeasement deal, there is one man to whom much credit will be due. That is General MacArthur.

Senator Nixon pointed out in a speech on May 12 the tremendous personal success which the General has already achieved by forcing the Administration to alter its Far East Policy as follows: (1) the U.S. is now formally committed to preventing Communist China from taking possession of Formosa; (2) we are now pledged to oppose the seating of the Chinese Communists in the UN; (3) Washington has had to crack down on our allies on the matter of shipping arms and strategic materials to Communist China -- and the UN has moved to embargo arms; (4) we have increased our military mission to Chiang Kai-shek's army and promised augmented aid.

As a result of these MacArthur victories, the State Department has been placed in a far stronger bargaining position than previously, and any honorable settlement which might be reached in Korea would owe much to the General.

* * * * *

THE PRISONER OF BLAIR HOUSE: While some Administration supporters have been cheered by the surprising aplomb publicly shown by the President in face of his present political adversity, certain elder Democratic figures on Capitol Hill have been correspondingly depressed.

The former, dwelling hopefully on Mr. Truman's cocky attitude, believe that he knows "something", some momentous secret which spells happy days again for the Administration. The latter, lugubrious members of Congress, however, take a quite contrary view: they interpret the blithe Presidential facade as indicating that the President knows exactly nothing at all, that from ignorance of the true situation arises his astounding bliss.

The latter view -- after we have canvassed all possible sources not only in the White House but also Blair House, and not overlooking some passengers on those yacht cruises down the Potomac -- impresses us very much. For the Palace Guard, skilled in artifices of flattery and concealment, seems to have performed a remarkable job of minimizing political difficulties, laughing off the genuinely bitter anti-Truman

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sentiment among "common men" and generally fortifying the President's morale by keeping the worst from him. The end product is the jaunty figure the President cuts as he appears in press conference.

This accomplishment of the Palace Guard, we believe (as we have stated before in this column) has been inspired by a true evaluation of the situation among themselves, and a haunting fear of their own fate if the President does not remain in office after '52. In that case, they not only would lose their jobs, but some would probably face the kleig lights of Congressional investigations, unprotected by a Chief Executive. Hence, the iron curtain they have built around Truman.

Now, this interesting situation "downtown" is well understood by Administration leaders "up on the Hill". The fact that there is no longer any close liaison between these Congressional leaders and the White House is nothing new. The fact, however, that the situation persists despite the grim reality of a heavy mail from constituents calling for impeachment of the President is to say the least terrifying. If events abroad turn out badly, if MacArthur continues to work his spell on the plebs, the harrassed leaders on the Hill fear the imponderable consequences of a real popular explosion -- to deal with which, neither they nor the White House have any plan.

* * * * *

AROUND THE TOWN: It is reported that Senator Joe McCarthy will soon make a trip to Formosa. Seeing is believing, and it may be that Joe still does not credit Administration promises to aid and arm Chiang Kai-shek's army.

---- General Bradley is scheduled to address a public meeting in Texas soon. The story around the Pentagon is that Bradley was requested to make this speech at the instance of Secretary Marshall. The $64 question asked is: did the President ask Marshall to request Bradley?

---- Left-wing Democrats have been pushing for an investigation of "wet backs" in border states. "Wet backs" is the term for Mexicans who enter the U.S. illegally (often swimming the Rio Grande) to labor on ranches in the southwestern states. It has been charged that these laborers are recruited by American ranchers. Right-wing Democrats would like to block such a probe. "It's dynamite", they say and add that big Administration figures, Senators, Governors and other potent members of the Democratic hierarchy have ranch interests which employ this labor.

---- General A. C. Wedemeyer, just resigned from the service, has been called to testify in the big hearings on the Hill. How Wedemeyer feels about the current Grand Debate may be illustrated by a story he likes to tell:

While assisting Washington in the training of troops in the Revolutionary War, von Steuben received a letter from a friend in Germany, who asked how the American soldier compared with the German. Von Steuben replied that the American soldiers compared favorably with the German, that they were brave, energetic and resourceful. But, von Steuben said, there was one fundamental difference. The American soldier always wanted to know why he was told to do something, and if he couldn't be told why, he wanted to know why he couldn't be told why. Wedemeyer says he likes this why spirit, thinks we ought to perpetuate it. And he adds -- "we should avoid slavish obedience".

* * * * *

THAT MUNDT SPEECH: History may one day mention that a highly important speech was given in the Senate Chamber and almost completely ignored by the press because simultaneously the spotlight was playing on the Secretary of Defense as he laboriously dodged questions in the Senate hearing room. The argument of Senator Mundt before the Senate on May 9, interspersed by comments from colleagues, took up most of the afternoon sitting, but yielded some rich gems.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For one thing, the senior Senator from South Dakota produced a sensational and hitherto unpublished letter from Secretary of State Dean Acheson. The letter addressed to Representative Berry of South Dakota, and given to Berry's colleague) stated that U.S. forces in Korea were in no way subject to directives from the United Nations, but only to the orders of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, in Washington. Acheson, after pointing out that the Security Council had no forces of its own and that the UN had taken no action transforming U.S. forces into UN forces, said flatly:

"The resolutions passed by the United Nations under which military action is being taken in Korea contain broad directives. No United Nations resolution attempts to give to the unified command (in Korea) instructions as to how military action is to be carried out or to place any limitation on military action taken in Korea to accomplish the objective of the Security Council resolutions to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in that area."

As Mundt said, "That gives us in the words of the Secretary of State, a clear-cut statement that the United Nations have no authority to limit, dilute, restrict or direct the military action being taken under the command of the United States commander in the field, and decided upon the Joint Chiefs of Staff." And Mundt made the point that the Administration cannot dodge responsibility or "pass the buck" by pretending that we must consult the UN and heed its inhibitions in the formulation and execution of our military plans.

But the Senator from South Dakota was also up to something else. Through his discourse and the remarks of his Republican colleagues in colloquy ran the theme: That the action in Korea is not "police action" but "war", that the President put us into war without consulting Congress or asking for a declaration of war by constitutional procedure, that the President put forces into Korea even before the UN acted, that the war in that area is an "American responsibility", etc. Those who listened carefully drew the conclusion that the Republicans were laying the basis for later proceedings, impeachment of the President -- as Mr. Arthur Sears Henning in the Washington Times Herald (May 14) put it -- for the "high crimes and misdemeanors" cited above.

* * * * *

YALTA AND POTSDAM: Our article "Repudiate Yalta and Potsdam" (April 25, 1951), by William Henry Chamberlin has drawn wide praise and discussion throughout the country and especially on Capitol Hill. It should be no surprise, therefore, to hear that Representative Lawrence Smith (Wis.), one of the most progressive leaders on the Hill in the field of foreign affairs, has introduced (May 14) a resolution calling for the formal repudiation by Congress of these two fatal executive agreements.

Mr. Smith supported his plea for repudiation of these two long-discredited "deals" with a high moral appeal: "We should confess that we sinned against man and God at Yalta and Potsdam. This would be good for the soul of America. By such an act we could atone for our immoral conduct against Poland, China and Germany. Such a courageous act would win us millions of friends all over the world. It would be a tonic to people who live under dictatorships and who have been losing faith in countries who parade under the banner of liberty, yet who have been parties to agreements that deny that very principle."

* * * * *

GERMAN ELECTION: Last week, dispatches from Germany emphasized alarm over gains made by a pro-Nazi minor political party in elections of the state of Lower Saxony. The existence of such a Party in Germany is indeed news, and that it made some electoral progress is worthy of notice. However, overemphasis on the slightest trace of Nazi survival has become such a habit among American correspondents in Western Germany (as this column has often pointed out) that last week's scary stories should be received with caution.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The facts are that the Socialist Party led the poll with 33 per cent of the vote and the party union of Chancellor Adenauer trailed with 23 per cent; next came a party representing expellees (indeed a phenomenon deserving of note); and in fourth place was the pro-Nazi Reichs Party.

Those who are familiar with this local election give us a more cogent explanation than that afforded by the New York Times and wire services. They suggest that the showing of the Reichs Party is not typical of Western Germany as a whole, since the area in question is one in which Hitler early scored his first local successes, and where many old Nazis remain.

But, the unreported feature of the campaign in Lower Saxony, our informants say, is the cynical political maneuvering of the Socialist Party. The state of Lower Saxony, it is explained, has a Socialist Government which has had full legal powers to squelch the first movements of this Nazi fledgling. But the Socialist Government sedulously refrained from doing so in the transparent hope that the Reichs Party would cut into the strength of the democratic parties opposing the Socialists. The Socialist Party throughout Germany, it is well known, has literally stopped at nothing in its political efforts to oust the Right-wing Government, headed by Chancellor Adenauer. Apart from the remarkable vote cast by the expellees for their party, the way the Socialists lived up to their Machiavellian record would seem to be the real news of the Lower Saxony election.

* * * * *

YOUR MONEY: A United Nations team of economists -- four foreigners and one from the University of Chicago -- has made a study of world conditions and come up with a scheme for raising the income of "underdeveloped" countries -- by two per cent.

What they have in mind will cost approximately nineteen billion dollars a year. Of this amount, it is proposed to raise by taxation about 5 billions in the "underdeveloped" countries. The balance will be contributed, it is announced, by the United States, Western Europe and Australia. "The economic experts clearly indicated", says the New York Times (May 14), "that success of their program hinged largely on the extent of United States participation." In short, if the UN graciously adopts this Point IV plan, we Americans will have the pleasure of being taxed by foreigners for the benefit of foreigners.

Someone should tell our international boondogglers that actually we have been experimenting for half a century with their Point IV cure-all down in Puerto Rico. The natives liked it so well that a substantial number of them fled to New York City, where they created a slum area of large proportions and, until the last election, regularly every two years sent Congress that great gift to democracy -- Vito Marcantonio. Some of those Puerto Ricans who stayed home to enjoy the benefits of Point IV sent another emissary -- an assassin to make an attempt on the life of President Truman.

* * * * *

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE: Congress is tackling a price control bill to replace the Act that expires on June 30. The Administration has asked for a law with "teeth". The prospect is it won't get one. Why? Simply because Congress knows all about the unpopularity of the present law. The opposition to it has been the most effective kind: civil disobedience. By midnight, May 1, the deadline for filing price lists by eating and drinking places, the OPS heard from less than 25 per cent of the nation's establishments, and these were mostly the larger ones. Other lines of business are likewise responding to OPS orders with silence. The controllers are learning the truism that a law which does not have the backing of public opinion cannot be enforced. You can't put a million people into jail.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED